

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 14, 18, 20, 21, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Dai. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dai is directed to a method of creating a dispersion of metal oxide nanoparticles on a alumina/silica support matrix. See col. 4, lines 24-31. The metal oxides serve as catalysts for the growth of carbon nanotubes. A block copolymer phase is created to direct the bonding of the metal oxides to the support matrix. See col. 4, lines 25-27. It is important to note that in Dai that the copolymers form a separate phase from the metal oxide catalysts. The metal catalysts are then bonded to the support matrix around this separate copolymer phase.

In comparison, independent claims 1 and 39 include “attaching one or more catalyst nanoparticles to one or more selected locations on at least one or more polymer molecules.” As explained above, Dai does not disclose or suggest attaching the catalyst particles to selected locations on the polymer molecules. Instead, the catalyst particles form around the copolymer phase. By being able to select locations on the polymer molecules for the bonding of the catalyst particles, the catalyst particles can be placed on the support much more accurately than in Dai. Since Dai does not disclose or suggest attaching the catalyst particles to selected locations on the polymer molecules as claimed, the rejections of claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 14, 18, 20, 21, 39 and 40, should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dai in view of Herr. Claims 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dai alone. Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dai in view of Chan. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dai and further in view of Bonard. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dai in view of Lieber. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-4, 9, 11, 15-17 and depend from claim 1, and accordingly, include the limitations of claim 1. As explained above, Dai does not disclose or suggest attaching the catalyst particles to selected locations on the polymer molecules as claimed. Further, none of the other references cited by the Examiner disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 2-4, 9, 11, 15-17, should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **070702006900**.

Dated: September 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,  
By \_\_\_\_\_  
**Jonathan Bockman**  
Registration No.: 45,640  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7755